

# Quarterly Report—Second Quarter FY2013

## Child and Family Services



### To contact us:

Child and Family Services  
195 North 1950 West  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
84116

Phone: 801-538-4100  
Fax: 801-538-3993  
[www.dcf.utah.gov](http://www.dcf.utah.gov)

# Contents

Each Quarter the State Office Data Unit of the Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS) produces an updated report of the status of the services we provide, the families with which we interact, our resource families and our employees across the state. This report contains information we collect in order to track trends within our services and our served population in addition to figures collected in order to meet federal reporting requirements. Please be aware that some data elements, particularly those that describe rural regions, may fluctuate in a broader range as they are influenced by a smaller number of cases. Please visit our website for more information or to view our Annual Report.

---

**Referrals**

Percent of referrals that are unaccepted ..... 5

**Child Protective Services (CPS) Cases**

Number of New CPS cases ..... 6

Priority Timeframes ..... 7

Percent of CPS Investigations Supported ..... 8

Percent of Supported Allegation Types ..... 8

Percent of Victims Receiving In-Home Service ..... 9

Percent of Victims Entering Foster Care ..... 10

*Case Process Review*

Definition ..... 11

CPS ..... 12

Unable to Locate ..... 12

*CPS Outcome Measures*

Measure 1—Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence ..... 13

---

# Contents

---

<b>In-Home Cases</b>	
Number of In-Home cases point in time .....	14
Number of New and Closed In-Home cases .....	15
In-Home Case Types .....	18
In-Home Median Case Length for open cases .....	19
In-Home Median Case Length for closed cases .....	20
<i>In-Home Process Review</i>	
Case Process Review for home based cases .....	21
In-Home Supervisor Finishing touches .....	22
<i>In-Home Outcome Measures</i>	
Percent of Child Clients with Subsequent Supported CPS within 12 months .....	23
Percent of Child Clients with Subsequent Foster Care within 12 month .....	24
<b>Foster Care Cases</b>	
Number of Foster Care cases .....	25
Number of New and Closed Foster Care Cases .....	26
New Foster Care Cases by Primary Reason .....	29
Substance abuse as a contributing factors .....	30
Percent of children in placements by structure at a point in time .....	31
Percent of children in placements by structure on the last day of the quarter .....	32
Median length of Foster Care cases .....	33
<i>Foster Care Process Review</i>	
Case Process Review for Foster Care placement .....	34
Foster Care health .....	35
Foster Care case planning .....	36
Foster Care visit performance .....	37
Foster Care Supervisor finishing touches .....	38

---

# Contents

<i>Foster Care Outcome Measures</i>	
Measure 2—Abuse by Foster Parents, Residential Staff .....	39
Percent of SCF children Exiting Care with a Supported CPS Case within 12 Months .....	40
Permanency 1 Measure 1—Percent of children who reunify in less than 12 months .....	41
Permanency 1 Measure 2—Median time to reunification .....	42
Permanency 1 Measure 3—Of entry cohort: Percent reunifying in less than 12 months .....	43
Permanency 1 Measure 4—Of exit cohort: percent who re-enter care in less than 12 months .....	44
Permanency 2 Measure 1—Of children exiting to adoption: percent who exit in less than 12 months .....	45
Permanency 2 Measure 2—Median time for all adoptions .....	46
Permanency 2 Measure 3—Of children in care 17+ months on the first of the year: percent who exit by the end of the year .....	47
Permanency 2 Measure 4—Of children in care 17+ months on the first of the year: percent who become legally free within 6 hrs .....	48
Permanency 2 Measure 5—Of children becoming legally free during the year: percent adopted within 12 months ..	49
Permanency 3 Measure 1—Of children in care 24+ mns on the first of the year: percent who achieve permanency by the end of the year ....	50
Permanency 3 Measure 2—Of children discharging from care who are legally free: percent discharging to permanent homes.....	51
Permanency 3 Measure 3—Of children who emancipate or turn 18: percent who had been in care 3 or more years .....	52
Permanency 4 Measure 1—Of children in care less than 12 months: percent with 2 placements or less .....	53
Permanency 4 Measure 2—Of children in care 12 to less than 24 months: percent with 2 placements or less .....	54
Permanency 4 Measure 3— Of children in care 24 or more months: percent with 2 placements or less.....	55
<hr/>	
<b>Foster Provider Information</b>	
Number of Resource families .....	56
<b>Kinship</b>	
Percent of Children Removed from Home where the First Placement was with a Relative .....	57
Percent of Children who Exited Care to Custody/Guardianship or Adoption with a Relative .....	58
Median Number of Months in Care for Children who Exit Custody and Guardianship to a Relative (excluding adoptions) .....	59
<b>Domestic Violence</b>	
Domestic Violence episodes .....	60
Domestic Violence Primary Reasons .....	61
<b>Employee Data</b>	
Caseload information .....	62
Average Caseloads .....	63

# Referrals


Each call to the DCFS Intake offices alleging abuse or neglect concerns is considered a referral. There are 9,000 referrals on average during each three month quarter.

Before determination of an unaccepted referral is made, policy and procedures are followed, including staffing the decision and documentation of the decision and required actions. This report pulls information based system entry date.

The data in the chart show the percentage referrals that were not accepted for investigation from all calls that Intake entered into SAFE. Calls entered into SAFE are categorized as accepted, unaccepted, reversal to unaccepted, additional information and information only.


Calls coded as additional information or information only are not included in the total number of referrals. Reversal to unaccepted and unaccepted referrals are both counted for in the total number of unaccepted referrals.

During the 4th quarter FY11 DCFS transitioned to a centralized intake that manages calls for the state. The process for categorizing calls by region has changed during this process. During the 1st quarter of FY12 approximately 16% of calls could not be categorized and are only represented in the division measurement. This was resolved for the 3rd quarter.



# CPS—New Investigations

The chart below shows the number of new child protective services (CPS) investigations initiated during the quarter based on the start date of the cases.




# CPS—Priority Timeframes


Each referral that leads to an investigation is given a priority ranking. The priority determines the time allotted for Intake to complete the referral process and for the assigned CPS caseworker to make face-to-face contact with the child. A priority 1 response is only assigned if there is an imminent threat to the safety and well-being of a child. In that case, the CPS caseworker has a maximum of 60 minutes in urban areas or 3 hours in rural areas from the moment Intake notifies the caseworker to make the face-to-face contact with an alleged victim.

A priority 2 response is assigned when physical evidence is at risk of being lost or the child is at risk of further abuse, neglect, or dependency, but the child does not have immediate protection and safety needs. The CPS caseworker has 24 hours from the moment Intake notifies the caseworker to make the face-to-face contact with the alleged victim.

A priority 3 response is assigned when potential for further harm to the child and the loss of physical evidence is low. The CPS caseworker has until midnight of the third working day from the moment Intake assigns the case to make the face-to-face contact with the alleged victim.




# CPS Outcomes—Investigations with Supported Results



Child Maltreatment 2011 (federal report based on National Child Abuse and Neglect Data Systems data for 50 states) reports that for 21% of investigated reports, at least one child was found to be a victim of maltreatment with dispositions of supported, indicated, or alternative response victim.


Utah's data to the left show a supported rate that is higher than the national average. There is a lot of state variability regarding what is accepted for investigation, and the definition of abuse and neglect.

Allegation types and definitions can be found in DCFS practice guidelines on the DCFS website. They have been grouped into main categories to the right. The most prevalent supported allegation type is Sexual Abuse. The Other Category consists of allegations of dependency, failure to protect, and safe relinquishment of a newborn child. Note that because children may be victims of more than one type of abuse the percent values add to more than 100%. Allegation definitions were altered in 2010 by statute and administrative rule.



# CPS Outcomes—Victims with Subsequent In-Home Services


Before taking a child into protective custody the Child and Family Services CPS caseworker shall determine whether there are services reasonably available that would eliminate the need to remove the child from the custody of his or her parent. Workers may also refer to community agencies or to ongoing DCFS In-Home services.



The chart above shows the percentage of substantiated victims receiving ongoing services in-home from DCFS within 30 days of a CPS case closure.

# CPS Outcomes—Percent of Victims Entering Foster Care

The chart below show the percentage of substantiated victims receiving ongoing out-of-home DCFS custody from the Division of Child and Family Services within 30 days of CPS case closure.



## CPS—Case Process Review Data

The Case Process Review (CPR) is conducted to measure whether workers are, as much as possible, following Practice Guidelines and documenting their work in SAFE. The state is currently monitoring performance in this area in-between reviews by using (1) reports extracted from the SAFE information system, and (2) having regional teams and supervisors review cases and enter information in a CPR quality assurance (QA) form in SAFE for those areas where information cannot be extracted from the system or where there needs to be extra attention.

For the CPR data charts you will see that some data elements are extracted from SAFE and some are extracted from the QA forms. Goals for these items vary from 85% to 90%. The discrepancy between the QA and the SAFE data may indicate either (1) workers are not documenting their efforts correctly even though they have done them, (2) the SAFE report programming needs to be checked, or (3) the QA data represents a small sample of cases and may not reflect overall performance. Additionally the SAFE extraction may not be able to account for exceptional circumstances that a case review may note. A blank indicates there were no applicable cases for that question.

The state Program Improvement Team (PIT) and the regional program improvement coordinators investigate areas on these reports where performance is low and do follow-up with workers and regions to ensure documentation is accurate and do training where necessary with a goal of improving performance.

Some regions are exploring using a different method of QA than the SAFE tool, consequently the QA percentage may appear lower for those regions.

# CPS—Case Review and Unable to Locate Data

Several elements of initial CPS involvement with a family are reviewed during a CPR, including the timeliness of starting and closing the investigation (A1 and A3), the depth of investigative actions (B1 through R4), and any initial services provided during the process of assessing new situations (A2). The CPS review also check for inquiries into the availability to kin as potential caretakers (R5).

		CPSG.1	CPSG.2	CPSG.3	CPSG.4	CPSG.5		CPSG.6	CPSG.7	CPSH.1	CPSH.2	D1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
		A1	A2	A3	B1	B2		B3	B4	C1	C2						
7/1/12 to 9/30/12		% Cases Reviewed/ Total Cases	Timeliness	Services	Case Closure	Victim interview	Mother interviewed	Father interviewed	3rd party interview	Unscheduled home visit	P1 med exam	Med neglect	Findings based on facts	first required visit	Weekly placement	Info to care provider	Inquire kin
Northern QA		2%		97%		100%	100%		100%	88%							
Northern SAFE		1242	94%		93%	94%	98%	94%	92%	85%		100%					
Salt Lake Valley QA		1%		100%		100%	100%		100%	100%		100%					
Salt Lake Valley SAFE		1861	92%		95%	98%	99%	98%	99%	96%		100%					
Western QA		0.4%		0%		100%	83%		67%	33%		100%					
Western SAFE		711	87%		85%	93%	91%	82%	83%	73%		100%					
Eastern QA		31%		90%		97%	89%		92%	89%		95%	33%	50%	67%	100%	
Eastern SAFE		294	89%		81%	96%	96%	89%	90%	86%							
Southwest QA		54%		100%		100%	98%		99%	98%		100%					
Southwest SAFE		402	94%		90%	95%	97%	94%	95%	89%		100%					
State QA		8%		97%		99%	96%		97%	94%		99%					
State SAFE		4552	92%		92%	96%	97%	93%	93%	87%		100%					
Goal			90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%

r\_cps\_cl\_cpr\_qaform\_regoff, r\_cps\_cl\_cpr\_summary\_regoff, r\_cps\_cl\_cpr\_universe\_general in CPS.pbl

To the right are data on CPS Unable to Locate Cases extracted from the SAFE system. Each question below assesses workers' efforts to try to locate the child about whom a report has been made.

4/1/12 to 6/30/12		Cases	1.A. HV	1.b.2nd HV	2.Schools	3.Police	4.Pub Assis	5.Referent	6. Phone Dir.
Northern SAFE		13	54%	31%	54%	69%	62%	46%	54%
Salt Lake Valley SAFE		33	64%	64%	88%	91%	94%	91%	85%
Western SAFE		8	50%	50%	88%	88%	88%	63%	63%
Eastern SAFE		5	40%	60%	80%	100%	80%	60%	100%
Southwest SAFE		7	57%	71%	57%	57%	86%	71%	57%
State SAFE		66	58%	56%	77%	83%	85%	74%	74%
Goal			90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%


r\_cps\_cl\_unabletolocate\_summary\_regoff in CPS.pbl

# CPS—Safety Measure 1: Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence

Recidivism occurs when a child who had previously been found to be a victim of a supported allegation at some time in the past, is involved in a new investigation because of a new allegation. Federal requirements require that child protective agencies report the percent of cases that remain free of repeat maltreatment for at least 6 months.


Data to the right show, of all children who were victims of a supported maltreatment allegation during the first six months of the time period, what percent were NOT victims of another supported allegation within the six months following that maltreatment incident. The national standard set by the federal government is 94.6% or higher based on FY04 data from 45 states. The range of performance was from 86 to 98%.

The arrow to the left of the graph indicates that DCFS is aiming to be above the goal line.



# In-Home—Cases Open on the Last day of the Quarter


The graph on this page includes all In-home type cases (Protective Services Counseling PSC, Protective Services Supervision PSS, Protective Family Preservation PFP, Family Reunification PFR, Clinical Counseling Services CCS, Counseling Individual Services CIS, Post Adoption Treatment PAT, and Protective Services Supervision PSI).




# In-Home—New and Closed Cases

The graphs below display the number of cases that opened and closed during each quarter. Only a portion of cases open and close in the same quarter. A change in the average length of In-Home cases would show as a reduction in closed cases compared to new cases. Case types are: Protective Services Counseling, Protective Services Supervision, Protective Family Preservation, Family Reunification, Clinical Counseling Services, Counseling Individual Services, Post Adoption Treatment, and Protective Services Supervision.

**Northern Region**




**Salt Lake Valley Region**




# In-Home—New and Closed Cases

The graphs below display the number of cases that opened and closed during each quarter. The Only a portion of cases open and close in the same quarter. A change in the average length of In-Home cases would show as a reduction in closed cases compared to new cases. Case types are: Protective Services Counseling, Protective Services Supervision, Protective Family Preservation, Family Reunification, Clinical Counseling Services, Counseling Individual Services, Post Adoption Treatment, and Protective Services Supervision.

**Western Region**




**Eastern Region**




# In-Home—New and Closed Cases

The graphs below display the number of cases that opened and closed during each quarter. Only a portion of cases open and close in the same quarter. A change in the average length of In-Home cases would show as a reduction in closed cases compared to new cases. Case types are: Protective Services Counseling, Protective Services Supervision, Protective Family Preservation, Family Reunification, Clinical Counseling Services, Counseling Individual Services, Post Adoption Treatment, and Protective Services Supervision.

**Southwest Region**



**Division**



## In-Home—Case Types and Home Studies




The table below shows the number of in-home cases served during the most recent quarter by case type. The table shows the variability in use of in-home codes across regions. In-Home services include: Clinical Counseling Services (CCS), Counseling Individual Services (CIS), Independent Home Study (IHS), Post Adoptive Treatment (PAT), Protective Family Preservation (PFP), Family Reunification (PFR), Protective Services Counseling (PSC), Protective Supervision Interstate (PSI), and Protective Services Supervision (PSS).

2nd Qtr FY13

	CCS	CIS	IHS	PAT	PFP	PFR	PSC	PSI	PSS
Northern		43	176	14	33	1	65	12	350
Salt Lake	1	46	368	32	89	10	83	27	234
Western	28	4	217	16			1	13	248
Eastern	14	16	130	5			32	6	181
Southwest	1	26	64	6			13	6	141
Division	44	135	956	73	122	11	194	64	1,154


# In-Home—Median Case Lengths on Open Cases

The median months in-home cases are open as measured on the last day of each quarter. Blank spaces indicate quarters with zero cases.



# In-Home—Median Length at Closure

The median months of closed in-home cases as measured on the last day of each quarter. Blank spaces indicate quarters with zero cases.



# In-Home—Case Process Review (CPR)

Below are the in-home CPR data. There have been changes to the mother and father policy involvement attachments in SAFE. The programming is being updated currently.

In-Home Cases										
		1	2	4.A1	4.A2	4.B	4.C	7A	7B	7C
10/1/12 to 12/31/12	Case Count	Current plan	Initial plan on time	Mother involved	Father involved	Stepparent involved	Child involved	Visit month 1	Visit month 2	Visit month 3
<b>Northern SAFE</b>	302	95%	90%	59%	47%		31%	95%	95%	86%
<b>Salt Lake Valley SAFE</b>	266	97%	79%	86%	72%		55%	92%	92%	91%
<b>Western SAFE</b>	191	87%	68%	59%	46%		34%	84%	85%	80%
<b>Eastern SAFE</b>	150	97%	82%	83%	69%		53%	94%	93%	90%
<b>Southwest SAFE</b>	114	100%	88%	89%	75%		49%	98%	90%	97%
<b>State SAFE</b>	1023	95%	82%	73%	59%		43%	93%	92%	88%
<b>Goal</b>		85%	85%	85%		85%	85%	85%	85%	85%



# In-Home—Supervisor Finishing Touches Data

The Division of Child and Family Services, along with the Office of Services Review, conducts annual Qualitative Case Reviews (QCR) in each region of the state to measure Child and Family Outcomes and System Status on In-Home and Foster Care Cases. To assist in improving target areas, the Division has a supervisory review process called “Supervisor Finishing Touches.” Supervisors regularly review selected cases of their workers and enter the results in a form in SAFE, marking any follow-up action needed. Some forms may have been excluded from the figures below due to the way dates were recorded in SAFE, however that will not be the case for future reports.

Supervisor Finishing Touches - In-Home																
		CFT1	CFT2	CFT3	CFT4	CFA	CFP1	CFP2A	CFP2B	CFP2D	CFP2E	TA1	TA2	LTV1	LTV2	CPRQA1
	Number of cases reviewed	Child and Family Team: Composition	Child and Family Team: Effectiveness	Child and Family Team: Coordination	Child and Family Team: Frequency	Child and Family Assessment	Planning Process	Involvement- Mothers	Involvement- Fathers	Involvement- Caregivers	Involvement- children (5+ years)	Tracking	Adaptation	Long Term View: Destination	Long Term View: Path	Policy Attachments
<b>10/1/12 to 12/31/12</b>																
<b>Northern</b>	<b>32</b>	94%	97%	97%	97%	100%	100%	94%	75%	41%	69%	100%	100%	97%	97%	91%
<b>Salt Lake Valley</b>	<b>59</b>	85%	85%	80%	81%	85%	83%	92%	53%	47%	64%	88%	86%	86%	83%	71%
<b>Western</b>	<b>20</b>	95%	85%	95%	75%	75%	95%	85%	75%	35%	65%	95%	95%	100%	95%	80%
<b>Eastern</b>	<b>50</b>	88%	94%	94%	94%	66%	88%	92%	60%	30%	82%	76%	78%	86%	86%	90%
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>18</b>	89%	94%	89%	94%	78%	94%	78%	61%	50%	56%	89%	89%	89%	83%	89%
<b>State</b>	<b>179</b>	89%	91%	89%	88%	80%	90%	90%	62%	40%	69%	88%	88%	90%	88%	83%


## In-Home Outcomes—Percent of In-Home Child Clients with Subsequent Supported CPS Cases within 12 Months

Approximately 90% of in-home child clients do not experience additional abuse and neglect for at least the year following the end of in-home services. Data for subsequent involvement are pulled for cases that ended in the same timeframe one year back.




## In-Home Outcomes—Percent of In-home Child Clients with a Subsequent Foster Care Case within 12 Months

Approximately 94% of in-home child clients successfully avoid out of home placements within the 12 months following the end of services. Data for subsequent involvement are pulled for cases that ended in the same timeframe one year back. A subsequent case is only counted if it starts more than 30 days after the initial case closes. This excludes counting those that have just progressed to higher intensity cases.





# SCF—Foster Care Cases Open on the Last Day of the Quarter

The chart below shows the number of open SCF cases on the last day of each quarter by region.





## SCF—Number of New and Closed Foster Care Cases

The graphs below display the number of cases that opened and closed during each quarter. The median case length is just over 12 months as seen on page 33, therefore only a portion of cases open and close in the same quarter. An increase in the median length of Foster Care cases would show as a reduction in closed cases compared to new cases.





# SCF—Number of New and Closed Foster Care Cases

The graphs below display the number of cases that opened and closed during each quarter. The median case length is just over 12 months as seen on page 33, therefore only a portion of cases open and close in the same quarter. An increase in the median length of Foster Care cases would show as a reduction in closed cases compared to new cases.




## SCF—Number of New and Closed Foster Care Cases

The graphs below display the number of cases that opened and closed during each quarter. The median case length is just over 12 months as seen on page 33, therefore only a portion of cases open and close in the same quarter. An increase in the median length of Foster Care cases would show as a reduction in closed cases compared to new cases.




# SCF— Foster Care Cases by Primary Reason



## SCF—Proportion of Removals where Substance Abuse is a Contributing Factor


The chart below shows the percent of total removals where there was a case contributing factor of drug abuse, alcohol abuse, fetal drug addiction, or fetal alcohol.




## SCF—Percent of Youth in Placements by Structure on the Last Day of the Quarter

Level I, II, and III are family home foster care. Level IV are proctor homes. Level V through VII are group homes. Level IRTS is special needs care. Youth in the “Other” category have run away and are therefore not currently in a placement.

**Percent of Youth in Placements by Structure Type on 12/31/12**




## SCF—Percent of Youth in Placements by Structure



# SCF—Median Length of Foster Care Cases


The length of cases measured at the time they close varies widely depending on what particular cases close each quarter. Large changes in the Median length are more common in regions with fewer case contributing to the measure.

Median months for Closed SCF cases



r\_scf\_cl\_avgmosbygoal

Median Months for SCF Cases Open on the Last Day of each Quarter



r\_scf\_sv\_avgmos\_bygoal\_off

# SCF—Case Process Review: Foster Care Placement

Foster Care CPR data are displayed on the next five pages.

Below is the information on placement decision making. The Program Improvement Team has found that the division is doing better at giving information to providers than is reflected in these numbers. The documentation is often located in the provider notes record which is not queried by this report. A strategy will be used to determine how to proceed with trying to measure this more accurately between reviews.

Foster Care Cases - Placement				
		I.A.2	I.A.4	I.A.5
7/1/12 to 12/31/12	# Cases	Locate kin	Proximity to parents	Info to provider
Northern SAFE	809	93%	76%	32%
Salt Lake Valley SAFE	1005	80%	84%	42%
Western SAFE	659	75%	78%	13%
Eastern SAFE	332	84%	72%	57%
Southwest SAFE	283	78%	75%	47%
State SAFE	3088	83%	79%	35%
Goal		85%	85%	85%

# SCF—Health

Below are foster care data on initial, annual, and follow-up health, mental health, and dental activities. Qualitative reviews indicate performance is close to the goal in meeting children’s health care needs. The Project Improvement Team (PIT) and the Fostering Healthy Children (FHC) teams are looking at performance by placement providers and workers.

<b>Foster Care Cases - Health</b>				
		II.1	II.3	II.5
7/1/12 to 12/31/12	# Cases	Initial or annual health	Initial or annual mental health	Initial or annual dental
<b>Northern SAFE</b>	<b>702</b>	81%	79%	87%
<b>Salt Lake Valley SAFE</b>	<b>874</b>	76%	79%	83%
<b>Western SAFE</b>	<b>546</b>	76%	70%	81%
<b>Eastern SAFE</b>	<b>280</b>	76%	79%	89%
<b>Southwest SAFE</b>	<b>256</b>	81%	81%	95%
<b>State SAFE</b>	<b>2658</b>	78%	77%	85%
<b>Goal</b>		85%	85%	85%

# SCF—Case Planning

SCF CPR data on case planning is below. Parent involvement in planning remains low, especially for fathers.

<b>Foster Care Cases - Planning</b>							
		IV.A.1	IV.A.2	IV.A.3mo	IV.A.3fa	IV.A.3sp	IV.A.3.ch
7/1/12 to 12/31/12	# Cases	Current plan	Initial plan on time	Mother involved	Father involved	Stepparent involved	Child involved
<b>Northern SAFE</b>	809	97%	87%	59%	36%	14%	71%
<b>Salt Lake Valley SAFE</b>	1005	94%	85%	69%	55%	14%	81%
<b>Western SAFE</b>	659	83%	74%	61%	38%	31%	78%
<b>Eastern SAFE</b>	332	94%	83%	71%	60%	41%	76%
<b>Southwest SAFE</b>	283	98%	94%	75%	62%	42%	79%
<b>State SAFE</b>	3088	93%	83%	65%	46%	23%	77%
<b>Goal</b>		85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%

# SCF—Visit Performance

Division performance on meeting the required visits in foster care are indicated below. All visit data are extracted from the SAFE system. There has been an improvement in performance related to private visits with child. The month six percentages tend to be slightly lower because workers have not completed their documentation for the prior month.

Foster Care Cases - Visits																			
		IB1.mo1	IB1.mo2	IB1.mo3	IB1.mo4	IB1.mo5	IB1.mo6	IB2.mo1	IB2.mo2	IB2.mo3	IB2.mo4	IB2.mo5	IB2.mo6	IB4.mo1	IB4.mo2	IB4.mo3	IB4.mo4	IB4.mo5	IB4.mo6
7/1/12 to 12/31/12	# Cases	Caretaker Visits	Child Private visits																
Northern SAFE	809	98%	96%	97%	97%	96%	95%	98%	97%	97%	98%	97%	95%	93%	92%	93%	93%	90%	90%
Salt Lake Valley SAFE	1005	98%	96%	95%	96%	96%	93%	98%	96%	96%	96%	95%	93%	92%	92%	91%	90%	89%	88%
Western SAFE	659	96%	96%	94%	94%	92%	83%	96%	96%	92%	91%	92%	82%	83%	84%	80%	80%	84%	75%
Eastern SAFE	332	99%	99%	97%	98%	98%	94%	98%	97%	97%	97%	99%	93%	89%	93%	88%	91%	90%	85%
Southwest SAFE	283	95%	95%	93%	96%	96%	95%	96%	96%	94%	96%	96%	94%	87%	89%	85%	91%	91%	93%
State SAFE	3088	98%	96%	95%	96%	95%	92%	97%	96%	95%	95%	95%	91%	90%	90%	88%	89%	88%	85%
Goal		85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%

# SCF—Supervisor Finishing Touches Data


The Division of Child and Family Services, along with the Office of Services Review, conduct annual Qualitative Case Reviews (QCR) in each region of the state to measure Child and Family Outcomes and System Status on In-Home and Foster Care Cases. Below are the Foster Care Data. To assist in improving target areas, the Division has a supervisory review process called “Supervisor Finishing Touches”. Supervisors regularly review selected cases of their workers and enter the results in a form in SAFE, marking any follow-up action needed.

Supervisor Finishing Touches - Foster Care																
		CFT1	CFT2	CFT3	CFT4	CFA	CFP1	CFP2A	CFP2B	CFP2D	CFP2E	TA1	TA2	LTV1	LTV2	CPRQA1
	Number of cases reviewed	Child and Family Team: Composition	Child and Family Team: Effectiveness	Child and Family Team: Coordination	Child and Family Team: Frequency	Child and Family Assessment	Planning Process	Involvement- Mothers	Involvement- Fathers	Involvement- Caregivers	Involvement- children (5+ years)	Tracking	Adaptation	Long Term View: Destination	Long Term View: Path	Policy Attachments
<b>7/1/12 to 12/31/12</b>																
<b>Northern</b>	<b>147</b>	95%	95%	95%	96%	98%	97%	73%	48%	80%	69%	99%	99%	96%	96%	57%
<b>Salt Lake Valley</b>	<b>240</b>	87%	88%	90%	87%	78%	84%	65%	43%	76%	68%	87%	86%	80%	79%	79%
<b>Western SAFE</b>	<b>57</b>	96%	98%	96%	93%	82%	96%	65%	46%	86%	74%	98%	95%	89%	88%	82%
<b>Eastern</b>	<b>69</b>	90%	94%	91%	90%	86%	88%	42%	32%	90%	71%	90%	90%	87%	84%	74%
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>65</b>	91%	95%	94%	88%	71%	97%	74%	55%	91%	69%	88%	86%	75%	72%	91%
<b>State</b>	<b>578</b>	91%	92%	92%	90%	83%	90%	65%	45%	81%	69%	91%	90%	85%	84%	74%

## SCF Outcomes—Safety Measure 2: Abuse by Foster Parents, Residential Staff


The second safety data measure is of all children served in foster care, what percent were NOT victims of a supported case of maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff member during the year. The national standard set by the federal government is 99.68% or higher based on FY04 data from 37 states. The range for this quarter was 99.60% to 100.00%.

**Parent or Residential Staff**



## SCF Outcomes—Percent of SCF Children Exiting Care with a Subsequent Supported CPS Case within 12 Months



Over 94% of children who leave foster care avoid subsequent abuse and neglect during the 12 months after leaving foster care during the most recent quarter. Data for subsequent involvement are pulled for cases that ended in the same timeframe one year back.



# Permanency Composite 1—Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification

## Measure 1—Timeliness of reunification


Measure 1 of this composite is of all children discharged from foster care to reunification who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home. There is no national standard set for individual measures, however the national 75th percentile on this measure is 75.2%.



# Permanency Composite 1—Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification

## Measure 2—Timeliness of reunification


Measure two is of all children who were discharged from foster care to reunification, and who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what was the median length of stay in months from the date of discharge to reunification. The national 75th percentile on this measure is 5.4 months.



# Permanency Composite 1—Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification

## Measure 3—Timeliness of reunification



Of all children who entered foster care for the first time in the 6-month period, and who remained in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent were discharged from foster care to reunification in less than 12 months from the date of latest removal from home. The national 75th percentile is 48.3%.



# Permanency Composite 1—Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification

## Measure 4—Permanency of reunification


Of all children who were discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12-month time period, what percent re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge. The national 75th percentile is 9.9%. This data processing method is currently being assessed for accuracy.



# Permanency Composite 2—Timeliness of Adoptions

## Measure 1—Timeliness of adoptions of children discharged from foster care.


Measure 1 evaluates of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption, what percent were discharged in less than 24 months from the date of latest removal from home. The national 75th percentile is 36.6%.



# Permanency Composite 2—Timeliness of Adoptions

## Measure 2—Timeliness of adoptions of children discharged from foster care.


Measure 2 evaluates of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption, what was the median length of stay in foster care in months from the date of latest removal from home to the date of discharge to adoption. The national 75th percentile is 27.3 months.



# Permanency Composite 2—Timeliness of Adoptions

## Measure 3—Progress toward adoption for children in foster care.


Measure 3 is of all children who were in foster care on the first day of the year, and who were in foster care for 17 continuous months or longer, what percent were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption by the last day of the year. The national 75th percentile is 22.7%.



# Permanency Composite 2—Timeliness of Adoptions

## Measure 4—Progress toward adoption for children in foster care.



Measure 4 is of all children who were in foster care on the first day of the year for 17 continuous months or longer, and who were not legally free for adoption prior to that day, what percent became legally free for adoption during the first 6 months of the year. The national 75th percentile is 10.9%.



# Permanency Composite 2—Timeliness of Adoptions

## Measure 5—Progress toward adoption of children who are legally free.



Measure 5 is of all children who became legally free for adoption during the year, what percent were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in less than 12 months of becoming legally free. The national 75th percentile is 53.7%.



# Permanency Composite 3—Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time

## Measure 1—Permanency for children in foster care for long periods of time.


This measure evaluates of all children who were in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year, what percent were discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday and by the end of the fiscal year. A child is considered discharged to a permanent home if the discharge reason is adoption, guardianship, reunification, or live with relative. The national 75th percentile is 29.1%.



# Permanency Composite 3—Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time

## Measure 2—Permanency for children in foster care for long periods of time.

This measure evaluates of all children who were discharged from foster care in the year who were legally free for adoption at the time of discharge, what percent were discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday. A child is considered discharged to a permanent home if the discharge reason is adoption, guardianship, reunification, or live with relative. The national 75th percentile is 98%.




# Permanency Composite 3—Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time

## Measure 3—Children growing up in foster care.

Of all children who either (1) were discharged from foster care during the year with a discharge reason of emancipation, or (2) reached their 18th birthday during the year while in foster care, what percent were in foster care for 3 years or longer. The national 75th percentile is 37.5%.


**Of Children emancipating or turning 18, percent in care 3 years or more**



## Permanency Composite 4—Placement Stability

### Measure 1—Placement Stability.


This measure evaluates of all children who were served in foster care during the year, and who were in foster care for at least 8 days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings. The national 75th percentile is 86%.



# Permanency Composite 4—Placement Stability

## Measure 2—Placement Stability.


This measure evaluates of all children who were served in foster care during the year, and who were in foster care for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings. The national 75th percentile is 65.4%.



# Permanency Composite 4—Placement Stability


## Measure 3—Placement Stability.

This measure evaluates of all children who were served in foster care during the year, and who were in foster care for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings. The national 75th percentile is 41.8%.



# Foster Care — Number of Resource Families

Below is information on providers with License types of Licensed Foster Care (LFC), Licensed Specific Care (LSC), Ute Foster Care (UFC), and Paiute Foster Care (PFC).




Note: Do to changes in the SAFE system, data for all quarters was repulled on 6/1/12 . The number of Resource Families may be slightly different than earlier reported due to back dated entries.

## Kinship — Percent of Children Removed from Home where the First Placement was with a Relative

In selecting a placement for a child in agency custody, preferential consideration will be given to a non-custodial parent, relative, or friend of the parent or guardian, as established in law, subject to the child’s best interests. First priority is to maintain a child safely at home. However, if a child cannot safely remain at home, kinship care has the potential for providing these elements of permanency by virtue of the kin’s knowledge of and relationship to the family and child.


**Percent of Children Removed from Home where First Placement was with a Relative**



	1st QT FY12	2nd QT FY12	3rd QT FY12	4th QT FY12	1st QT FY13	2nd QT FY13
■ Northern	30%	22%	26%	36%	39%	27%
■ Salt Lake	29%	42%	27%	30%	25%	32%
■ Western	25%	37%	25%	30%	28%	30%
■ Eastern	11%	14%	20%	30%	29%	42%
■ Southwest	23%	25%	15%	26%	23%	23%
■ Division	26%	29%	24%	31%	30%	31%


## Kinship — Percent of Children Who Exited Custody to Custody/Guardianship or Adoption with a Relative

In cases where reasonable efforts to reunify the child and parent were not successful, custody or adoption by relatives is pursued whenever appropriate. A relative is an adult who is a grandparent, great grandparent, aunt, great aunt, uncle, great uncle, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepparent, first cousin, stepsibling, or sibling of the child.



## Kinship — Median Number of Months in Care for Children who Exit Custody and Guardianship to a Relative (excluding adoptions)


Child and Family Services will make active efforts to locate potential kinship caregivers for placement of a child in agency custody and to build and sustain family connections for the child. All children need and are entitled to enduring relationships that provide a family, stability, belonging, and a sense of self that connects children to their past, present, and future. Blank spaces indicate quarters with zero cases.



# Domestic Violence Shelters

The chart below shows the number of clients served in domestic violence shelters statewide. These data are collected from 15 shelters statewide who received funding to provide DV Services. They enter data monthly via a secure web-site. Clients with multiple episodes within a shelter or between shelters may be counted more than once. The figures below includes both adult and child victims.


The rise and fall of episodes during the 1st Qtr and the 2nd Qtr reflects changes in the capacity of Salt Lake shelters including an addition to one facility and a reduction in another.



# Primary Reason— Domestic Violence Cases

These data represent domestic violence (DV) cases opened in the SAFE system and do not include DV Shelter cases.

**DVS Cases Served by Primary Reason 2nd QT FY13**



Case Management include cases where only case management services are provided; i.e., home visits, safety planning, etc.

Contracted Treatment are cases where the provider is contracted to provide treatment services.

DCFS Treatment are cases where a DCFS worker is providing clinical treatment services.

Treatment Tracking cases are opened when the court has ordered treatment and the outcome is tracked by DCFS. A Contracted Treatment case may be open at the same time.

# Caseload Information

Caseloads are calculated by adding all cases for workers, designated by service area based on the majority of the worker's cases, and dividing the total number of cases by the number of caseworkers. Data are taken as of the last day of the quarter. Cases for Supervisors are included as are cases for lead workers. However, supervisors are not included in the caseworker count and lead workers are counted as 3/4 caseworker because the expectation is that three fourths of their time is casework, and one fourth is worker mentoring. Except for family preservation workers, caseworkers with less than 8 cases are not included.


**Average Number of Caseworkers with full load by**

Service Area	Fiscal Year 2010			Fiscal Year 2011				Fiscal Year 2012				Fiscal Year 2013	
	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd
CPS	89	105.5	90.5	101	85.5	98	78	89.5	92	101.5	90	89	86
Foster Care	214.5	220	225	204	203.5	198	203	203.5	206.5	219.5	208	214	221
In-home	32	24.5	25	16.5	16.5	25	29	22	21.5	19	22	21	24
Family Pres.	18	24	22	11	15.5	19.5	14.5	17.5	14.5	11.5	16.5	15	17
Generalist*	23.5	24.5	27	34.5	27.5	20.5	29	21.5	24	21	23	21	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>398.5</b>	<b>389.5</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>348.5</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>353.5</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>358.5</b>	<b>372.5</b>	<b>359.5</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>372</b>
<b>Average Caseload</b>													
CPS	12.1	13.6	12.8	13.6	11.9	13.3	12.5	12.6	12.8	13.6	12.6	13.5	12.8
Foster Care	14	14.2	13.9	16.1	15.7	15	14.5	14.4	13.8	14.6	15.1	14.5	13.8
In-home	14	13.6	13.4	15	14	12.2	12.1	12.8	12.7	14.7	13.5	12.1	12.8
Family Pres.	9.2	9.8	8.6	9.4	8.6	7.9	6.8	7	7.3	7.8	5.6	6.1	5.7
Generalist*	14.3	15.4	14.5	13.3	17.1	17.1	14.3	18.2	17.8	18.3	17.8	17	15.9
<b>Overall</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>

# Caseloads

The average number of cases per worker as measured on the last day of each fiscal quarter.

### Average Division Caseload



	4th Qt FY '10	1st Qt FY '11	2nd Qt FY '11	3rd Qt FY '11	4th Qt FY '11	1st QT FY12	2nd QT FY12	3rd QT FY12	4th Qt FY '12	1st QT FY13	2nd QT FY13
◆ CPS	12.8	13.6	11.9	13.3	12.5	12.6	12.8	13.6	12.6	13.5	12.8
■ Out-of-home	13.9	16.1	15.7	15	14.5	14.4	13.8	14.6	15.1	14.5	13.8
▲ In-home	13.4	15	14	12.2	12.1	12.8	12.7	14.7	13.5	12.1	12.8